

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed February 16, 2006; and further in light of a telephone interview with the Examiner conducted on June 19, 2006, wherein the probability of a new search being required as a result of the present amendment was discussed. Reconsideration of this application in view of the below remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 9-24 are pending in the application with Claims 9-11, 16-18 and 23-24 being in independent form. By the present response, Claims 9, 16, 23 and 24 are amended. No new subject matter is introduced into the disclosure by way of the present amendments.

I. Rejection of Claims 9 - 24 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 9 – 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,690,410 issued to Mochida et al.

The Examiner alleges that Mochida discloses an endoscope 3 including a CCD 2, a signal processing device including a first signal processor (i.e., patient circuit 5), which includes an A/D converter 24 that is insulated by a photocoupler 15e from a second signal processor (any one of 29, 32, 33, etc.), all of which inherently have outputs, a connector 35, and a signal processing section (i.e., expansion substrates 41, 42 and 43) detachably connected to the connector and inherently having an output. (See: col. 9, lines 37-60).

However, in FIG. 6, Mochida clearly shows only one signal processor situated on the main substrate. The expansion substrates 41, 42 and 43 are not equipped with a second signal processor. Consequently, Mochida fails to anticipate all the elements of Applicant's invention as recited in Claims 10, 11, 17 and 18. Therefore, regarding Claims 10, 11, 17 and 18, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Additionally, the present Office Action does not address Applicant's second processor in Claims 9, 16, 23 and 24 because, in the Examiner's opinion, such a second signal processor is not required as recited in Applicant's Claims 9, 16, 23 and 24. In response, Claims 9, 16, 23 and 24 have been amended to positively recite a second signal processor.

Thus, Mochida fails to anticipate a first signal processor that implements a signal process of the image signal and outputs the processed image signal with a first output format; a first connector adapted for connecting the signal processing device to a second signal processor; and an option substrate having the second signal processor and a second connector for connecting the second signal processor to the signal processing device via the first connector, the second signal processor implements the signal process of the image signal and outputs the processed image signal with a second output format, both the first output format and the second output format being display formats, as recited in independent Claim 9. Independent Claims 16, 23 and 24 recite similar limitations with regards to a first signal processor and a second signal processor.

Consequently, with regard to the rejection of claims 9-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), an electronic endoscope and signaling apparatus having the features discussed above and as recited in independent claims 9-11, 16-18 and 23-24, is nowhere disclosed in Mochida.

It is well-settled by the Courts that "[a]nticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim." Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist and Derrick Company, et al., 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481 (Fed. Cir., 1984). Therefore, since Mochida does not disclose each and every element recited in the present claims, Claims 9-11, 16-18 and 23-24 are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited prior art reference. Claims 12-15 and 19-22 depend from independent Claims 11 and 18 and thus include all the limitations recited by these independent

claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 9-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).




CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 9 – 24 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,


Paul J. Esatto, Jr.
Registration No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza - Ste. 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

PJE:DAT:jam